arXiv:0903.2738v1 [math.PR] 16 Mar 2009

Stationary Systems of Gaussian Processes

Zakhar Kabluchko

March 16, 2009

Institut für Mathematische Stochastik, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen,
Goldschmidtstr. 7 D-37077, Göttingen, Germany
Email: kabluch@math.uni-goettingen.de

Abstract

We describe all countable particle systems on $\mathbb{R}$ which have the following three properties: independence, Gaussianity, and stationarity. More precisely, we consider particles on the real line starting at the points of a Poisson point process with intensity measure $\mathfrak{m}$ and moving independently of each other according to the law of some Gaussian process ξ. We describe all pairs $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ generating a *stationary* particle system, obtaining three families of examples. One of these families appeared in connection with extremes of independent Gaussian processes in [Z. Kabluchko, M. Schlather, L. de Haan, Stationary max-stable fields associated to negative definite functions, Ann. Probab. (2009), in press].

AMS 2000 Subject Classification: Primary, 60G15; secondary, 60G55
Key words and phrases: Gaussian processes, Poisson point processes, processes with stationary increments, particle systems, stationarity, extremes

1 Introduction

1.1 Statement of the problem

We are interested in at most countable systems of particles moving randomly on the real line in such a way that the following three requirements are satisfied:

(A1) The particles are independent of each other.

(A2) The law describing the motion of each particle is Gaussian and the same for all particles.

(A3) The particles are in an equilibrium.

The independence stated in requirement (A1) implies that the starting positions of particles should be scattered independently over $\mathbb{R}$, which, in more rigorous terms, means that they should form a not necessarily homogeneous

Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}$. Requirement (A2) means that the stochastic processes describing the deviations of the particles from their starting positions should be Gaussian, having the same law for all particles, and, by requirement (A1), independent of each other. In view of this, the meaning of the first two requirements may be described in rigorous terms as follows.

Let $\{U_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}$ with intensity measure $\mathfrak{m}$. We will always assume that $\mathfrak{m}$ satisfies the following integrability condition:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\varepsilon x^2} d\mathfrak{m}(x) < \infty \quad \text{for every } \varepsilon > 0. \tag{1}$$

In most cases of interest, the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ will be infinite, and so let us agree to use $\mathbb{N}$ as an index set for the points U_i, even though the case where $\mathfrak{m}$ is finite (and, hence, a.s. only finitely many points U_i exist) is not formally excluded.

Let $\xi_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$, be independent copies of a Gaussian process $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. We define $V_i(t)$, the position of i-th particle at time $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (which we allow to be multidimensional), by

$$V_i(t) = U_i + \xi_i(t). \tag{2}$$

Definition 1. The random collection of functions $\mathfrak{P} = \{V_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ will be called the *independent Gaussian particle system* (or simply *Gaussian system*) generated by the pair $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$. We use the notation $GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$.

Remark 1. It should be stressed that we *do not* assume the process ξ to have zero mean, which means that we allow for a deterministic component in the random motion of particles. In general, it also may happen that $\xi(0) \neq 0$, in which case the particles make non-zero jumps immediately after starting at U_i.

Let us turn to requirement (A3). Given $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define a point process $\mathfrak{P}_{t_1,\ldots,t_n}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by recording the positions of particles at times $t_1, \ldots, t_n$. That is, we set

$$\mathfrak{P}_{t_1,\ldots,t_n} = \{(V_i(t_1), \ldots, V_i(t_n)), i \in \mathbb{N}\}. \tag{3}$$

The family $\{\mathfrak{P}_{t_1,\ldots,t_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}, t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ may be viewed as the family of "finite-dimensional distributions" of $\mathfrak{P}$.

Definition 2. A Gaussian system $\mathfrak{P}$ is called *stationary* if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and every $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have the following equality of laws of point processes on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\mathfrak{P}_{t_1+h,\ldots,t_n+h} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathfrak{P}_{t_1,\ldots,t_n}. \tag{4}$$

1.2 Statement of the main result

The purpose of this paper is to provide a description of all stationary Gaussian systems. Before we can state our main result, we need to recall some definitions.

A stochastic process $\{W(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is called *stationary* if the law of the process $\{W(t+h), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ does not depend on the choice of $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A process $\{W(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is said to have *stationary increments* if the law of $\{W(t +$

$h) - W(h), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ does not depend on $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Trivially, every stationary process has stationary increments. Another family of examples of processes with stationary increments is provided by fractional Brownian motions: A zero-mean Gaussian process $\{W_\kappa(t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is called fractional Brownian motion with index $\kappa \in (0, 2]$ if

$$\operatorname{Cov}(W_\kappa(t_1), W_\kappa(t_2)) = |t_1|^\kappa + |t_2|^\kappa - |t_1 - t_2|^\kappa.$$

Convention 1. All stationary processes and processes with stationary increments are always supposed to have *zero mean.*

A function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *additive* if $f(t_1 + t_2) = f(t_1) + f(t_2)$ for every $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Under minor additional assumptions, say, measurability, an additive function must be of the form $f(t) = \langle c, t\rangle$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We will often encounter measures having a density of the form $e^{-\lambda x}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$ the measure on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{e}_\lambda(x)}{dx} = e^{-\lambda x}.$$

In particular, $\mathfrak{e}_0$ is the Lebesgue measure itself.

The next theorem is our main result.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all pairs $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$, where $\mathfrak{m}$ is a measure satisfying* (1) *and $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a Gaussian process, with the property that the particle system $GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ is stationary. Then*

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3, \tag{5}$$

where the sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$ are defined as follows:

1. *The set $\mathcal{S}_1$ consists of all pairs $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$, where $\mathfrak{m}$ is an arbitrary measure on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying* (1), *and*

   $$\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \overset{d}{=} \{W(t) + c, t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$$

   for some stationary Gaussian process $\{W(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ and some $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

2. *The set $\mathcal{S}_2$ consists of all pairs $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$, where*

   $$\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \overset{d}{=} \{W(t) + f(t) + c, t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$$

   for some $\alpha > 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, a Gaussian process $\{W(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ with stationary increments, and an additive function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$.

3. *The set $\mathcal{S}_3$ consists of all pairs $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$, where*

   $$\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda \quad \textit{and} \quad \{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \overset{d}{=} \{W(t) - \lambda\sigma^2(t)/2 + c, t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$$

   for some $\alpha > 0$, $\lambda \neq 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and some Gaussian process $\{W(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ with stationary increments and variance $\sigma^2(t)$.

Although Theorem 1 classifies all pairs $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ generating a stationary Gaussian system, it does not says how to tell whether two given pairs $(\mathfrak{m}', \xi')$, $(\mathfrak{m}'', \xi'')$ generate equal Gaussian systems or not. This gap will be filled in Section 3. Now let us state only the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *The decomposition* $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1^* \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3$, *where* $\mathcal{S}_1^* = \mathcal{S}_1 \backslash (\mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3)$, *is disjoint. Pairs belonging to different sets in this decomposition generate different in law Gaussian systems.*

1.3 Discussion

To summarize, we have three disjoint families $\mathcal{S}_1^*$, $\mathcal{S}_2$, and $\mathcal{S}_3$ of stationary Gaussian systems. It will be convenient to refer to their representatives as to type $\mathcal{S}_1^*$, type $\mathcal{S}_2$, and type $\mathcal{S}_3$ systems.

The stationarity of Gaussian systems of type $\mathcal{S}_1^*$ is a rather trivial fact and is due to the stationarity of the driving process ξ. Somewhat less trivial, but still rather appealing is the fact that Gaussian systems of type $\mathcal{S}_2$ are stationary. An example of a Gaussian system of type $\mathcal{S}_2$ can be obtained by taking $\mathfrak{m}$ to be the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and ξ to be a fractional Brownian motion with a linear drift. Surprisingly, the class of stationary Gaussian systems is not exhausted by the two "trivial" families $\mathcal{S}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$: there is one more, non-trivial, family $\mathcal{S}_3$. An example of a Gaussian system of type $\mathcal{S}_3$ can be obtained by taking

$$\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{e}_1 \text{ and } \{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}\} \overset{d}{=} \{W_\kappa(t) - |t|^\kappa, t \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

where $\{W_\kappa, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a fractional Brownian motion with index $\kappa \in (0, 2]$. For $\kappa = 1$, this Gaussian system appeared in [1] in connection with extremes of independent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. For general $\kappa \in (0, 2]$, the driving process $W_\kappa(t) - |t|^\kappa$ appeared in [12], also in connection with extremes of Gaussian processes. The results of [1] were generalized in [7]. In particular, it was shown in Theorem 2 of [7] that Gaussian systems of type $\mathcal{S}_3$ with an additional requirement $\alpha = 1$, $\lambda = 1$, $c = 0$ are stationary.

The main concern of this paper will be to prove the "difficult" part of Theorem 1, saying that any pair generating a stationary Gaussian system must belong to at least one of the three families $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$. This will be done in Section 2.

At a first sight, it may look that the family $\mathcal{S}_2$ can be included into the family $\mathcal{S}_3$ by allowing the parameter λ to be 0 in the definition of $\mathcal{S}_3$. However, this is not the case: the family $\mathcal{S}_2$ has an additional "degree of freedom" represented by the additive function f.

In view of particle systems interpretation of Theorem 1, of special interest are Gaussian systems driven by a process ξ satisfying $\xi(0) = 0$. In the next corollary we provide a classification of such systems, excluding for convenience the non-interesting case in which ξ is a version of the zero process.

Corollary 1. *Let* $\mathfrak{m}$ *be a measure satisfying* (1), *and let* $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *be a Gaussian process with* $\xi(0) = 0$. *Assume that for some* t_0, $\xi(t_0)$ *is not a.s.* 0.

Then the particle system $GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ *is stationary iff* $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$ *for some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$*, and*

$$\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \overset{d}{=} \begin{cases} \{W(t) + f(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} & \textit{provided that } \lambda = 0, \\ \{W(t) - \lambda\sigma^2(t)/2, t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} & \textit{provided that } \lambda \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

for some Gaussian process $\{W(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *with stationary increments, variance* $\sigma^2(t)$*, and* $W(0) = 0$*, and, eventually, an additive function* $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$*.*

A natural class of particle systems that has been much studied in the literature but is not the subject of the present paper can be obtained by requiring the motion of the individual particles to be Markovian rather than Gaussian. More precisely, choose the starting positions of the particles accordingly to the law of a Poisson point process with σ-finite intensity measure $\mathfrak{m}$ on some measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$, and let the particles move independently of each other accordingly to the law of a Markov process on Ω with transition kernel $P(x, dy)$. In this setting, the stationarity question has a rather natural solution: It was shown in [2] that such particle system is stationary provided that the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ is P-invariant. Various aspects of Markovian particle systems were studied in [4, p. 404], [2], [10], [8], [11], see also the references therein.

Let us also mention that various particle systems driven by Gaussian processes and belonging to type $\mathcal{S}_2$ in the above classification were studied in [6], [14], [5]. These papers focus on the behavior of a fixed "tagged" particle in a gas of independent Gaussian particles, and their results and methods are rather different from ours.

1.4 Organization of the paper

Our main result, Theorem 1, will be proved in Section 2. The classification of stationary Gaussian systems will be completed in Section 3, where we give necessary and sufficient conditions for two pairs to generate equal in law systems.

2 Proof of the main result

2.1 Notation

This section will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. We start by introducing the notation. We always assume that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a measure on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying the integrability condition (1), and that $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a Gaussian process. The law of the process ξ is uniquely determined by its mean and covariance for which we use the notation

$$\mu(t) = \mathbb{E}\xi(t), \quad r(t_1, t_2) = \mathrm{Cov}(\xi(t_1), \xi(t_2)). \tag{6}$$

Further, we define the variance and the incremental variance of ξ by

$$\sigma^2(t) = \mathrm{Var}\, \xi(t), \quad \gamma(t_1, t_2) = \mathrm{Var}\, [\xi(t_1) - \xi(t_2)]. \tag{7}$$

We will often use the identity

$$r(t_1,t_2)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\sigma^2(t_1)+\sigma^2(t_2)-\gamma(t_1,t_2)\right). \tag{8}$$

Given $t_1,\dots,t_n\in\mathbb{R}^d$, the law of the random vector $(\xi(t_1),\dots,\xi(t_n))$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{n}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}$.

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the Borel σ-algebra of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a set $B\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}$, it will be convenient to define

$$B-x=B-(x,\dots,x).$$

So, $B-x$ is obtained by shifting the set B "diagonally", in the direction of the vector $(1,\dots,1)$.

Define $\mathfrak{P}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}$, the finite-dimensional distributions of $\mathfrak{P}$, as in (3). The transformation theory of Poisson point processes, see Proposition 3.8 in [13], tells that $\mathfrak{P}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}$ is a Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with intensity measure $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}$ that is defined by

$$\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{P}[(\xi(t_1),\dots,\xi(t_n))\in B-x]d\mathfrak{m}(x),\quad B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{9}$$

In particular, we will often use that $\mathfrak{m}_t=\mathfrak{m}*\mathfrak{n}_t$ for every $t\in\mathbb{R}^d$, where $*$ denotes the convolution of measures. Note that condition (1) ensures that $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B)$ is finite for every bounded $B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We can restate Definition 2 as follows: A Gaussian system $\mathfrak{P}$ is stationary if for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, every $t_1,\dots,t_n,h\in\mathbb{R}^d$, and every $B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B)=\mathfrak{m}_{t_1+h,\dots,t_n+h}(B). \tag{10}$$

We denote the one-dimensional Gaussian measure with expectation μ_0 and variance σ_0^2 by $\mathfrak{N}(\mu_0,\sigma_0^2)$. For future reference, let us recall the following formula for the Laplace transform of a Gaussian distribution:

$$\text{if } N\sim\mathfrak{N}(\mu_0,\sigma_0^2),\ \text{then } \mathbb{E}[e^{yN}]=e^{\mu_0 y+\frac{\sigma_0^2y^2}{2}}. \tag{11}$$

2.2 Two lemmas

The next two lemmas are standard. We include their proofs only for completeness.

Lemma 1. *The process $W(t):=\xi(t)-\mu(t)$ has stationary increments iff for all $t_1,t_2,h\in\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\gamma(t_1,t_2)=\gamma(t_1+h,t_2+h). \tag{12}$$

Proof. We prove only sufficiency, since the necessity is evident. So, assume that (12) holds. Let $W_h(t)=W(t+h)-W(h)$. We have

$$\operatorname{Cov}(W_h(t_1),W_h(t_2))=r(t_1+h,t_2+h)+r(h,h)-r(h,t_1+h)-r(h,t_2+h).$$

Applying (8) and taking into account that $\gamma(h,h)=0$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Cov}(W_h(t_1),W_h(t_2)) = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\gamma(t_1+h,t_2+h)-\gamma(h,t_1+h)-\gamma(h,t_2+h)\right).$$

By (12), we obtain

$$\mathrm{Cov}(W_h(t_1),W_h(t_2)) = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\gamma(t_1,t_2)-\gamma(0,t_1)-\gamma(0,t_2)\right).$$

Hence, the law of the process $\{W_h(t), t\in\mathbb{R}^d\}$ is independent of h, which proves the lemma. ☐

Lemma 2. *Let $g:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying*

$$g(t_2+h)-g(t_1+h)=g(t_2)-g(t_1) \tag{13}$$

for all $t_1,t_2,h\in\mathbb{R}^d$. Then the following holds:

1. *The function $f(t):=g(t)-g(0)$ is additive.*
2. *Either $g\equiv const$ or the set of values of g is dense in $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Inserting $t_2:=s_1$, $h:=s_2$, $t_1:=0$ into (13) yields $f(s_1+s_2)=f(s_1)+f(s_2)$ and proves the first part of the lemma. To prove the second part, assume that g is not constant, which means that there is t with $f(t)\neq 0$. A standard inductive argument using the additivity of f gives $f(qt)=qf(t)$ for every rational number q. This implies that the set of values of the function f, and hence also the set of values of g, is dense in $\mathbb{R}$. ☐

2.3 Proof of the easy part of Theorem 1

In the next three propositions we prove that Gaussian systems of types $\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2,\mathcal{S}_3$ are indeed stationary.

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathfrak{P}=GS(\mathfrak{m},\xi)$, where $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)\in\mathcal{S}_1$. Then $\mathfrak{P}$ is stationary.*

Proof. By definition of $\mathcal{S}_1$, we have the following equality of laws, valid for all $t_1,\dots,t_n,h\in\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$(\xi(t_i))_{i=1}^n \stackrel{d}{=} (\xi(t_i+h))_{i=1}^n.$$

Let $B\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ be any Borel set. By (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi(t_1),\dots,\xi(t_n))\in B-z]d\mathfrak{m}(z)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi(t_1+h),\dots,\xi(t_n+h))\in B-z]d\mathfrak{m}(z)\\ &= \mathfrak{m}_{t_1+h,\dots,t_n+h}(B).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, Eq.(10) holds and $\mathfrak{P}$ is stationary. ☐

Proposition 3. *Let* $\mathfrak{P} = GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$*, where* $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_2$*. Then* $\mathfrak{P}$ *is stationary.*

Proof. By definition of $\mathcal{S}_2$, we have $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha > 0$, and

$$(\xi(t_i) - \xi(t_1))_{i=1}^n \stackrel{d}{=} (\xi(t_i + h) - \xi(t_1 + h))_{i=1}^n \tag{14}$$

for all $t_1, \dots, t_n, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be any Borel set. By (9),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B) && (15)\\
&= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 1_{B-x}(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\mathfrak{n}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(y_1, \dots, y_n) dx\\
&= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 1_{B-(x+y_1)}(0, y_2 - y_1, \dots, y_n - y_1) d\mathfrak{n}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(y_1, \dots, y_n) dx\\
&= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 1_{B-z}(0, y_2 - y_1, \dots, y_n - y_1) d\mathfrak{n}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(y_1, \dots, y_n) dz\\
&= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi(t_i) - \xi(t_1))_{i=1}^n \in B - z] dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and replacing $t_1, \dots, t_n$ by $t_1 + h, \dots, t_n + h$, we get

$$\mathfrak{m}_{t_1+h,\dots,t_n+h}(B) = \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi(t_i + h) - \xi(t_1 + h))_{i=1}^n \in B - z] dz. \tag{16}$$

Comparing (15) and (16) and taking into account (14), we obtain that (10) holds. Hence, $\mathfrak{P}$ is stationary. ☐

Proposition 4. *Let* $\mathfrak{P} = GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$*, where* $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_3$*. Then* $\mathfrak{P}$ *is stationary.*

Proof. In the particular case $\alpha = 1$, $\lambda = 1$, and $c = 0$, the stationarity of $\mathfrak{P}$ was proved in Theorem 2 of [7]. The general case follows by a straightforward application of affine transformations. ☐

2.4 Proof of Theorem 1: identifying the driving process ξ

In Section 2.3 we have shown that $\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3 \subset \mathcal{S}$. Here we prove the more difficult converse inclusion under an additional assumption on the measure $\mathfrak{m}$. This is stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *Let* $\mathfrak{m}$ *be a measure of the form* $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta\mathfrak{e}_0$ *for some* $\alpha \geq 0$*,* $\beta \geq 0$*,* $\lambda \neq 0$*, and let* $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *be a Gaussian process. Assume that* $\mathfrak{P} = GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ *is stationary. Then* $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3$*, where* $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$ *are as in Theorem 1.*

The proof of Proposition 5 will be based on the following lemma which allows to do explicit calculations with measures which are obtained by taking mixtures of diagonally shifted and exponentially weighted bivariate normal laws.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathfrak{n}$ be the law of a bivariate Gaussian vector (X_1, X_2) with $\mathbb{E}X_i = \mu_i$, $\operatorname{Var} X_i = \sigma_i^2$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $\operatorname{Var}(X_1 - X_2) = \gamma$. Let $\mathfrak{l}$ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$ defined for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\mathfrak{l}(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\kappa z} \mathfrak{n}(B - z) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{17}$$

Then there is a measure $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$ concentrated on the line $\{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 = 0\}$ such that the following representation holds:

$$\mathfrak{l}(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\kappa z} \mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}(B - z) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{18}$$

The Laplace transform of $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$, defined as $\psi^{(\kappa)}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{ux_2} d\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}(x_1, x_2)$, is given by

$$\psi^{(\kappa)}(u) = \exp\left\{(\kappa - u)(\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\sigma_1^2) + u(\mu_2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\sigma_2^2) + \frac{1}{2}u(u - \kappa)\gamma\right\}. \tag{19}$$

Remark 2. Eq.(19) shows that the measure $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$ is a multiple of a Gaussian measure with explicitly computable parameters. However, we will not need this.

Remark 3. If the Gaussian measure $\mathfrak{n}$ has a density, then it is possible to compute the density of $\mathfrak{l}$ directly from its definition, Eq.(17). However, since $\mathfrak{n}$ (and also $\mathfrak{l}$) may fail to have a density, we use a somewhat more complicated representation of $\mathfrak{l}$ as an exponentially weighted shift of the essentially one-dimensional measure $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$ given in (18).

Proof of Lemma 3. Define

$$\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{\kappa x_1} 1_B(0, x_2 - x_1) d\mathfrak{n}(x_1, x_2), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{20}$$

By construction, the measure $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$ is concentrated on the line $\{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 = 0\}$. Using transformations similar to those in [7], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{l}(B) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\kappa z} 1_{B-z}(x_1, x_2) d\mathfrak{n}(x_1, x_2) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\kappa(z+x_1)} e^{\kappa x_1} 1_{B-(z+x_1)}(0, x_2 - x_1) d\mathfrak{n}(x_1, x_2) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\kappa w} e^{\kappa x_1} 1_{B-w}(0, x_2 - x_1) d\mathfrak{n}(x_1, x_2) dw. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Applying (20) to the right-hand side of the above equation, we obtain (18).

Now we compute $\psi^{(\kappa)}(u)$, the Laplace transform of $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$. The Laplace transform of $\mathfrak{n}$ is defined as

$$\psi(u_1, u_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{u_1 x_1 + u_2 x_2} d\mathfrak{n}(x_1, x_2).$$

By a two-dimensional analogue of (11), $\psi(u_1, u_2)$ is given by

$$\psi(u_1, u_2) = \exp\left\{\mu_1 u_1 + \mu_2 u_2 + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1^2 u_1^2 + 2r u_1 u_2 + \sigma_2^2 u_2^2)\right\}, \tag{22}$$

where $r = \mathrm{Cov}(X_1, X_2) = (\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - \gamma)/2$. It follows from (20) that

$$\psi^{(\kappa)}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{\kappa x_1} e^{u(x_2 - x_1)} d\mathfrak{n}(x_1, x_2) = \psi(\kappa - u, u).$$

The above equation and (22) yield (19) after an elementary calculation. $\square$

We will also need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4. *Fix $\kappa \neq 0$. Let $\mathfrak{l}$ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$ admitting a decomposition*

$$\mathfrak{l}(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\kappa z} \mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}(B - z) dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{l}^{(0)}(B - z) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{23}$$

where $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$ and $\mathfrak{l}^{(0)}$ are measures concentrated on the line $\{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 = 0\}$. Then the measures $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}$ and $\mathfrak{l}^{(0)}$ are uniquely determined.

Proof. Fix some set $A \in \mathcal{B}(R)$. For $x > 0$, let B_x be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ defined by $B_x = \cup_{y \in [0,x]}(A + y)$. Then (23) implies that

$$\mathfrak{l}(B_x) = \left(\int_0^x e^{-\kappa z} dz\right) \mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}(A) + x \mathfrak{l}^{(0)}(A).$$

The above is valid for every $x > 0$, and so, $\mathfrak{l}^{(\kappa)}(A)$ and $\mathfrak{l}^{(0)}(A)$ are determined uniquely. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5. Recall from (6) and (7) that $\mu(\cdot)$, $\sigma^2(\cdot)$, and $\gamma(\cdot, \cdot)$ are the expectation, the variance, and the incremental variance of the process ξ. We start by deducing three statements about μ, σ^2, and γ under various assumptions on α, β, λ.

Claim 1. Assume that $\alpha > 0$. Then for all $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mu(t_2) - \mu(t_1) = -\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(\sigma^2(t_2) - \sigma^2(t_1)\right). \tag{24}$$

Proof. The measure $\mathfrak{m}_t = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_t$ has a density given by the convolution formula

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{m}_t(x)}{dx} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\alpha e^{-\lambda(x-y)} + \beta) d\mathfrak{n}_t(y) = \alpha e^{-\lambda x} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda y} d\mathfrak{n}_t(y) + \beta.$$

Applying (11) to the first term on right-hand side, we obtain

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{m}_t(x)}{dx} = \alpha e^{-\lambda x} \exp\left\{\mu(t)\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(t)\lambda^2\right\} + \beta. \tag{25}$$

By stationarity of $\mathfrak{P}$, we must have $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1} = \mathfrak{m}_{t_2}$ for every $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This leads to (24). $\square$

Before we can prove our next claim, we need to do some preparations. We consider the "two-dimensional distributions" of $\mathfrak{P}$. Take $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and recall that $\mathfrak{P}_{t_1,t_2} = \{(V_i(t_1), V_i(t_2)), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}^2$. By (9), its intensity measure $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,t_2}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_{t_1,t_2}(B) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\alpha e^{-\lambda x} + \beta)\mathfrak{n}_{t_1,t_2}(B - x)dx \\ &= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\lambda x}\mathfrak{n}_{t_1,t_2}(B - x)dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{n}_{t_1,t_2}(B - x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Applying Lemma 3 twice with $\kappa = \lambda$, resp. $\kappa = 0$, and $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{n}_{t_1,t_2}$, we obtain two measures on $\mathbb{R}^2$, called $\mathfrak{m}^{(\lambda)}_{t_1,t_2}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}$, which are concentrated on the line $\{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 = 0\}$ and have the property that for each Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,t_2}(B) = \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\lambda x}\mathfrak{m}^{(\lambda)}_{t_1,t_2}(B - x)dx + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{m}^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}(B - x)dx. \tag{27}$$

Claim 2. Assume that $\alpha > 0$. Then for all $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\gamma(t_1, t_2) = \gamma(t_1 + h, t_2 + h). \tag{28}$$

Proof. By stationarity, $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}$ for all $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Applying Lemma 4 to the decomposition (27), we obtain

$$\mathfrak{m}^{(\lambda)}_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m}^{(\lambda)}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}.$$

Recall that the measures $\mathfrak{m}^{(\lambda)}_{t_1,t_2}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^{(\lambda)}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}$ were constructed by means of Lemma 3 and thus have Laplace transforms given by the right-hand side of (19). So, we obtain that the expression (considered as a polynomial in u)

$$(\lambda - u)\left(\mu(t_1) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sigma^2(t_1)\right) + u\left(\mu(t_2) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sigma^2(t_2)\right) + \frac{1}{2}u(u - \lambda)\gamma(t_1, t_2)$$

does not change if we replace t_1, t_2 by $t_1 + h, t_2 + h$. Taking into account that by Claim 1,

$$\mu(t_i) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sigma^2(t_i) = \mu(t_i + h) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sigma^2(t_i + h), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

we arrive at (28). □

Claim 3. Assume that $\beta > 0$. Then for all $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mu(t_2) - \mu(t_1) = \mu(t_2 + h) - \mu(t_1 + h) \tag{29}$$

and

$$\gamma(t_1, t_2) = \gamma(t_1 + h, t_2 + h). \tag{30}$$

Proof. It follows from the decomposition (27) and Lemma 4 that

$$\mathfrak{m}^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m}^{(0)}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}.$$

Using the formula for the Laplace transform of $\mathfrak{m}^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^{(0)}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}$ given in (19), we obtain that the expression (considered as a quadratic polynomial in u)

$$u(\mu(t_2) - \mu(t_1)) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma(t_1, t_2)u^2$$

remains unchanged if we replace t_1, t_2 by t_1+h, t_2+h. This yields (29) and (30). $\square$

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Proposition 5. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. Assume that $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. We show that in this case, $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Combining Claim 1 and Claim 3, we obtain

$$\sigma^2(t_2) - \sigma^2(t_1) = \sigma^2(t_2 + h) - \sigma^2(t_1 + h).$$

Since $\sigma^2(t) \geq 0$, it follows from Part 2 of Lemma 2 that $\sigma^2(t)$ is a constant function. By Claim 1, $\mu(t)$ is constant as well. Finally, by (8) and Claim 2,

$$\begin{aligned} r(t_1 + h, t_2 + h) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\sigma^2(t_1 + h) + \sigma^2(t_2 + h) - \gamma(t_1 + h, t_2 + h)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(2\sigma^2(0) - \gamma(t_1, t_2)\right) \\ &= r(t_1, t_2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the Gaussian process $W(t) := \xi(t) - \mu(t)$ is stationary. Hence, $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_1$.

Case 2. Assume that $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta > 0$. We show that in this case, $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_2$. First of all, note that in this case, $\mathfrak{m}$ is a multiple of $\mathfrak{e}_0$. By Eq.(30) of Claim 3 and Lemma 1, the process $W(t) := \xi(t) - \mu(t)$ has stationary increments. Further, the function $f(t) = \mu(t) - \mu(0)$ is additive by Eq.(29) of Claim 3 and Part 1 of Lemma 1. So, we obtain a decomposition $\xi(t) = W(t) + f(t) + \mu(0)$ implying that $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_2$.

Case 3. Assume that $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta = 0$. We show that in this case, $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_3$. First, we have $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$. Second, Claim 2 and Lemma 1 show that the process $W(t) := \xi(t) - \mu(t)$ has stationary increments. It follows from Claim 1 that

$$\mu(t) = -\lambda\sigma^2(t)/2 + \mu(0) + \lambda\sigma^2(0)/2 = -\lambda\sigma^2(t)/2 + c,$$

where we have set $c = \mu(0) + \lambda\sigma^2(0)/2$. Hence, $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_3$.

The proof of Proposition 5 is complete. $\square$

2.5 Lemmas on convolution equations

In this section we collect several lemmas on solutions of convolution equations. Their proofs are based on explicit calculations with Laplace transforms and on the result of [3].

Lemma 5. *Let* $\mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$ *be a Gaussian measure on* $\mathbb{R}$. *Let* $\mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2$ *be two measures satisfying* (1) *such that*

$$\mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{m}_2 * \mathfrak{n}_0. \tag{31}$$

Then $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_2$.

Proof. We assume that $\sigma_0^2 > 0$, since otherwise, the statement of the lemma is trivial. The density of the measure $\mathfrak{m}_i * \mathfrak{n}_0$, $i = 1, 2$, is given by the convolution formula

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(\mathfrak{m}_i * \mathfrak{n}_0)}{dx} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{(x-y-\mu_0)^2}{2\sigma_0^2}} d\mathfrak{m}_i(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_0^2}} e^{\frac{x\mu_0}{\sigma_0^2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{xy}{\sigma_0^2}} e^{-\frac{(y+\mu_0)^2}{2\sigma_0^2}} d\mathfrak{m}_i(y). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Define new measures $\mathfrak{m}_1'$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2'$ by

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{m}_i'(y)}{d\mathfrak{m}_i(y)} = e^{-\frac{(y+\mu_0)^2}{2\sigma_0^2}}, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{33}$$

Let $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}_i'}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{xy} d\mathfrak{m}_i'(y)$, $i = 1, 2$, be the Laplace transforms of $\mathfrak{m}_1'$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2'$. Note that by (1), $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}_1'}(x)$ and $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}_2'}(x)$ are finite for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We may rewrite (32) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(\mathfrak{m}_i * \mathfrak{n}_0)}{dx} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_0^2}} e^{\frac{x\mu_0}{\sigma_0^2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{xy}{\sigma_0^2}} d\mathfrak{m}_i'(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_0^2}} e^{\frac{x\mu_0}{\sigma_0^2}} \varphi_{\mathfrak{m}_i'}\left(\frac{x}{\sigma_0^2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

By (31), the densities of the measures $\mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_0$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2 * \mathfrak{n}_0$ must be equal. Taking into account (34), this yields

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}_1'}(x) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{m}_2'}(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By the uniqueness of the Laplace transform, $\mathfrak{m}_1' = \mathfrak{m}_2'$. Recalling (33) yields that $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_2$. This proves the lemma. ☐

Lemma 6. *Let* $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}_2 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_1^2)$ *be two Gaussian measures on* $\mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\sigma_1^2 \leq \sigma_2^2$. *Let* $\mathfrak{m}_1$ *and* $\mathfrak{m}_2$ *be two measures satisfying* (1) *such that*

$$\mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_2 * \mathfrak{n}_2. \tag{35}$$

Then $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_2 * \mathfrak{N}(\mu_2 - \mu_1, \sigma_2^2 - \sigma_1^2)$.

Proof. We may rewrite (35) as

$$\mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_1 = \big(\mathfrak{m}_2 * \mathfrak{N}(\mu_2 - \mu_1, \sigma_2^2 - \sigma_1^2)\big) * \mathfrak{n}_1.$$

The proof is completed by applying Lemma 5. $\square$

Lemma 7. *Let* $\mathfrak{m}$ *be a measure satisfying* (1), *and let* $\mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$ *be a Gaussian measure such that for some* $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, $\lambda \neq 0$,

$$\mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_0 = \alpha \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0. \tag{36}$$

Then $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha e^{-\lambda^2\sigma_0^2/2} e^{-\lambda\mu_0} \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$.

Proof. Define a measure $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \alpha e^{-\lambda^2\sigma_0^2/2} e^{-\lambda\mu_0} \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$. Then the density of the measure $\mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_0$ can be computed by means of the convolution formula:

$$\frac{d(\mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_0)(x)}{dx} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\alpha e^{-\lambda^2\sigma_0^2/2} e^{-\lambda\mu_0} e^{-\lambda(x-y)} + \beta) d\mathfrak{n}_0(y) = \alpha e^{-\lambda x} + \beta,$$

where the second equality follows from (11). Hence,

$$\mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{m}_1 * \mathfrak{n}_0.$$

By Lemma 5, we have $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_1$. The proof is completed. $\square$

Lemma 8. *Let* $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}_2 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2)$ *be two Gaussian measures on* $\mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$. *Let* $\mathfrak{m}$ *be a measure satisfying* (1) *such that*

$$\mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_2. \tag{37}$$

Then $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$ *for some* $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$ *and* $\lambda \neq 0$.

Proof. By symmetry, we may assume that $\sigma_1^2 < \sigma_2^2$. Then Lemma 5 implies that

$$\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_0, \tag{38}$$

where $\mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu_2 - \mu_1, \sigma_2^2 - \sigma_1^2)$. By Theorem 3' of [3], every solution $\mathfrak{m}$ of (38) can be represented as a mixture of exponentials, that is we may write

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{m}(y)}{dy} = \int_E e^{-\lambda y} d\rho(\lambda),$$

where ρ is a finite measure on the set $E = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\lambda x} d\mathfrak{n}_0(x) = 1\}$. Now, in our case the measure $\mathfrak{n}_0$ is Gaussian, and so (11) shows that E consists of at most two points. One of them is always 0, and the second is denoted by λ (if $E = \{0\}$, let $\lambda \neq 0$ be arbitrary). Taking $\alpha = \rho(\{\lambda\})$ and $\beta = \rho(\{0\})$, we obtain $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

2.6 Proof of Theorem 1: Identifying the measure $\mathfrak{m}$

In this section we complete the proof of the inclusion $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3$. Let $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ be a pair generating a stationary Gaussian system $\mathfrak{P} = GS(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$. Our goal is to show that

$$(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3. \tag{39}$$

The idea of the proof will be to show, whenever possible, that the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ is of the form $\alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta\mathfrak{e}_0$ and then to apply Proposition 5. In all other cases, we will prove that $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_1$.

Assume for a moment that $\xi(0) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Var}\xi(t_0) > 0$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Under this restriction, the proof takes the following particularly simple form. By stationarity, we have $\mathfrak{m}_0 = \mathfrak{m}_{t_0}$. Using $\xi(0) = 0$, this can be written as $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{n}_{t_0}$. Applying to this convolution equation the result of [3] as in the proof of Lemma 8, we conclude that $\mathfrak{m}$ must be of the form $\alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta\mathfrak{e}_0$. Hence, Proposition 5 is applicable and (39) is proved.

In the rest of the section, we are occupied with the proof of Theorem 1 in full generality. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. Assume that the function σ^2 is not constant. So, there are $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\sigma^2(t_1) \neq \sigma^2(t_2). \tag{40}$$

By stationarity of $\mathfrak{P}$, we must have $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1} = \mathfrak{m}_{t_2}$ and hence,

$$\mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\mu(t_1), \sigma^2(t_1)) = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\mu(t_2), \sigma^2(t_2)).$$

Then Lemma 8, which is applicable in view of (40), implies that $\mathfrak{m} = \alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta\mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, $\lambda \neq 0$. An application of Proposition 5 shows that (39) holds.

Case 2. Assume that $\sigma^2(t) = \sigma^2 \geq 0$ is constant. Take some $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and fix some $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$. Consider $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1,t_2}$, a point process on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1,t_2} = \{U_i + \vartheta\xi_i(t_1) + (1-\vartheta)\xi_i(t_2), i \in \mathbb{N}\}, \tag{41}$$

where the U_i and the ξ_i are as in Section 1.1. Recalling from (2) that $V_i(t) = U_i + \xi_i(t)$, we may rewrite (41) as

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1,t_2} = \{\vartheta V_i(t_1) + (1-\vartheta)V_i(t_2), i \in \mathbb{N}\}. \tag{42}$$

By Proposition 3.8 of [13], $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1,t_2}$ is a Poisson point process whose intensity measure $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2}$ is given by the formula

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\tilde{\mu}(t_1, t_2), \tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1, t_2)),$$

where

$$\tilde{\mu}(t_1, t_2) = \vartheta\mu(t_1) + (1-\vartheta)\mu(t_2) \tag{43}$$

and

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1,t_2) = (\vartheta^2 + (1-\vartheta)^2)\sigma^2 + 2\vartheta(1-\vartheta)r(t_1,t_2). \tag{44}$$

The stationarity of the particle system $\mathfrak{P}$ together with representation (42) shows that for every $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the point processes $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1,t_2}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}$ must have the same law. Hence, $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2} = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1+h,t_2+h}$ and consequently,

$$\mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\tilde{\mu}(t_1,t_2), \tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1,t_2)) = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\tilde{\mu}(t_1+h,t_2+h), \tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1+h,t_2+h)). \tag{45}$$

The proof will be completed after we have considered two subcases.

Subcase 2a. Assume that for some $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$r(t_1,t_2) \neq r(t_1+h, t_2+h). \tag{46}$$

Take $\vartheta = 1/2$ in the definition of the point process $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}_{t_1,t_2}$. Then (44) and (46) imply that

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1,t_2) \neq \tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1+h,t_2+h).$$

By Lemma 8, applied to (45), the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ is of the form $\alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta\mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, $\lambda \neq 0$. An application of Proposition 5 shows that (39) holds.

Subcase 2b. Assume that for all $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$r(t_1,t_2) = r(t_1+h,t_2+h). \tag{47}$$

This implies that the process $W(t) := \xi(t) - \mu(t)$ is stationary.

If the function μ is constant, then $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Therefore, let us assume that μ is not constant. We will show that this implies that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a multiple of the Lebesgue measure. Let

$$G = \{g \in \mathbb{R} : \mathfrak{m} * \delta_g = \mathfrak{m}\}$$

be the set of "periods" of $\mathfrak{m}$, where δ_g is the Dirac measure concentrated at g. Clearly, G is an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}$.

By stationarity of $\mathfrak{P}$, we have $\mathfrak{m}_{t_1} = \mathfrak{m}_{t_2}$ for every $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Equivalently,

$$\mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\mu(t_1), \sigma^2) = \mathfrak{m} * \mathfrak{N}(\mu(t_2), \sigma^2).$$

By Lemma 6, this implies that

$$\mu(t_1) - \mu(t_2) \in G \quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{48}$$

Since μ is assumed to be non-constant, Eq.(48) implies that $G \neq \{0\}$, which means that $\mathfrak{m}$ has a non-trivial period. Of course, this is not sufficient to conclude that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a multiple of the Lebesgue measure, and so, let us use the stationarity of the two-dimensional distributions of $\mathfrak{P}$. Recalling (44) and taking into account (47), we obtain that for every $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1,t_2) = \tilde{\sigma}^2(t_1+h,t_2+h).$$

Applying Lemma 6 to (45), we obtain

$$\tilde{\mu}(t_1, t_2) - \tilde{\mu}(t_1 + h, t_2 + h) \in G \quad \forall t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Recalling a formula for $\tilde{\mu}$ given in (43), we arrive at

$$\vartheta \cdot (\mu(t_1) - \mu(t_2) - \mu(t_1 + h) + \mu(t_2 + h)) + (\mu(t_2) - \mu(t_2 + h)) \in G.$$

Note that this is valid for every $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$. Assume that in the above expression, ϑ appears with a non-zero coefficient for some t_1, t_2, h. Then G contains a non-trivial interval, and so, we must have $G = \mathbb{R}$. In other words, the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ is translation invariant. Since by (1), $\mathfrak{m}$ is finite on bounded intervals, this implies that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a multiple of the Lebesgue measure.

So, let us assume that for every $t_1, t_2, h \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mu(t_1) - \mu(t_2) = \mu(t_1 + h) - \mu(t_2 + h). \tag{49}$$

Recall also that we assume that μ is non-constant. Hence, by Part 2 of Lemma 2, the set of values of the function μ is dense in $\mathbb{R}$. By (48), the group G must be dense in $\mathbb{R}$.

We claim that in fact, $G = \mathbb{R}$. To prove this, we need to show that G is closed. First of all, the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ is atomless, since if it would have an atom, then the invariance under G would imply that $\mathfrak{m}$ has a dense set of atoms of equal mass, which would contradict (1). Now, let $g_1, g_2, \ldots$ be a sequence in G converging to some $g \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim that $g \in G$. Indeed, for every interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathfrak{m}([a - g, b - g]) = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mathfrak{m}([a - g_i, b - g_i]) = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mathfrak{m}([a, b]) = \mathfrak{m}([a, b]),$$

where the first equality holds since $\mathfrak{m}$ is atomless, and the second equality follows from $g_i \in G$. This proves that $g \in G$. Therefore, the group G, being dense and closed, must be equal to $\mathbb{R}$.

The fact that $G = \mathbb{R}$ means that the measure $\mathfrak{m}$ is translation invariant and thus, must be a multiple of the Lebesgue measure. Therefore, we can apply Proposition 5 which shows that (39) holds.

The proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

3 Pairs generating equal in law Gaussian systems

In this section we give an answer to the following question: Given two pairs $(\mathfrak{m}', \xi')$ and $(\mathfrak{m}'', \xi'')$ in $\mathcal{S}$, determine whether $GS(\mathfrak{m}', \xi')$ has the same law as $GS(\mathfrak{m}'', \xi'')$. A first step in this direction is Proposition 1 which we now prove.

Proof of Proposition 1. We will show that Gaussian systems generated by pairs belonging to different sets in the decomposition $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1^* \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3$ differ by their one-dimensional distributions. If $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)\in\mathcal{S}_2$, then $\mathfrak{m}=\alpha\mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha>0$, and consequently, $\mathfrak{m}_t=\mathfrak{m}*\mathfrak{n}_t=\alpha\mathfrak{e}_0$ for every $t\in\mathbb{R}^d$. If $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)\in\mathcal{S}_3$, then $\mathfrak{m}=\alpha\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$ for some $\alpha>0$ and $\lambda\neq 0$. Hence, in this case, $\mathfrak{m}_t=\mathfrak{m}*\mathfrak{n}_t=\tilde{\alpha}\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$ for some $\tilde{\alpha}>0$. Finally, if $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)\in\mathcal{S}_1^*$, then $\mathfrak{m}_t$ is not a multiple of $\mathfrak{e}_\lambda$, $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, Lemma 7 would imply that the same is true for $\mathfrak{m}$, which contradicts the assumption $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)\in\mathcal{S}_1^*$. □

In the sequel, we concentrate on pairs belonging to the same set in the decomposition. Let us call a pair $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)$ belonging to $\mathcal{S}_2$ or $\mathcal{S}_3$ canonical if $\xi(0)=0$. A classification of such pairs was given in Corollary 1.

Proposition 6. *For every $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)\in\mathcal{S}_2$ there is a unique canonical pair $(\tilde{\mathfrak{m}},\tilde{\xi})\in\mathcal{S}_2$ generating the same Gaussian system as $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)$.*

Proof. To show the existence, set $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}=\mathfrak{m}$ and $\tilde{\xi}(t)=\xi(t)-\xi(0)$. Applying (15) two times, we obtain that for every $B\subset\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{m}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B)&=\alpha\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{P}[(\xi(t_i)-\xi(t_1))_{i=1}^n\in B-z]dz\\&=\alpha\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{P}[(\tilde{\xi}(t_i)-\tilde{\xi}(t_1))_{i=1}^n\in B-z]dz\\&=\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,\dots,t_n}$ are the finite-dimensional intensities of $GS(\tilde{\mathfrak{m}},\tilde{\xi})$, cf. (9). Hence, $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)$ and $(\tilde{\mathfrak{m}},\tilde{\xi})$ generate equal in law Gaussian systems.

We prove the uniqueness part. Let $(\mathfrak{m},\xi)$ be a canonical pair. Then $\mathfrak{m}=\alpha\mathfrak{e}_0$ and $\xi(t)=W(t)+f(t)$, see Theorem 1. We will show that the triple (α,W,f) is uniquely determined by the finite-dimensional distributions of $\mathfrak{P}=GS(\mathfrak{m},\xi)$.

First, we have $\mathfrak{m}_t=\mathfrak{m}*\mathfrak{n}_t=\alpha\mathfrak{e}_0$ for every $t\in\mathbb{R}^d$, and so, α is uniquely determined. Let us turn to the two-dimensional distributions of $\mathfrak{P}$. By (9), we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_{0,t}=\alpha\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathfrak{n}_{0,t}(B-z)dz.$$

By Lemma 3, there is a representation

$$\mathfrak{m}_{0,t}=\alpha\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathfrak{m}_{0,t}^{(0)}(B-z)dz$$

for some measure $\mathfrak{m}_{0,t}^{(0)}$ concentrated on the line $\{(x_1,x_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2:x_1=0\}$ and having the Laplace transform $\exp\{f(t)u+1/2\gamma(0,t)u^2\}$. By Lemma 4, this shows that the two-dimensional distributions of $\mathfrak{P}$ determine $f(t)$ and $\gamma(0,t)$ uniquely. To see that $\gamma(0,t)$ determines the law of W uniquely, recall that $W(0)=0$ and hence, we may write the covariance function of W in the form

$$r(t_1,t_2)=\frac{1}{2}(\gamma(0,t_1)+\gamma(0,t_2)-\gamma(0,t_1-t_2)).$$

This completes the proof of the uniqueness part. □

Proposition 7. *For every* $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi) \in \mathcal{S}_3$ *there is a unique canonical pair* $(\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}, \tilde{\xi}) \in \mathcal{S}_3$ *generating the same Gaussian system as* $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$.

Proof. All necessary ingredients are contained in [7]. Take $\tilde{\xi}(t) = \xi(t) - \xi(0)$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathfrak{m} * \delta_c$, where c is as in Theorem 1. The fact that $(\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}, \tilde{\xi})$ and $(\mathfrak{m}, \xi)$ generate equal Gaussian systems was essentially shown in Proposition 11 of [7]. The uniqueness part follows under the additional assumption $\lambda = 1$ from Remark 24 of [7]. The general case is analogous. $\square$

The next proposition gives a necessary and sufficient condition on two pairs belonging to $\mathcal{S}_1^*$ to generate equal in law Gaussian systems.

Proposition 8. *Let* $(\mathfrak{m}', \xi')$ *and* $(\mathfrak{m}'', \xi'')$ *be two pairs, both belonging to* $\mathcal{S}_1^*$ *and generating Gaussian systems* $\mathfrak{P}'$ *and* $\mathfrak{P}''$. *Then*

$$\mathfrak{P}' \overset{d}{=} \mathfrak{P}'' \tag{50}$$

iff the following holds: There is a Gaussian variable N_0 *whose distribution on* $\mathbb{R}$ *is denoted by* $\mathfrak{n}_0$ *and which is independent of* ξ', ξ'', *such that*

$$\mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{m}'' * \mathfrak{n}_0 \text{ and } \{\xi''(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \overset{d}{=} \{\xi'(t) + N_0, t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}, \tag{51}$$

or

$$\mathfrak{m}'' = \mathfrak{m}' * \mathfrak{n}_0 \text{ and } \{\xi'(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \overset{d}{=} \{\xi''(t) + N_0, t \in \mathbb{R}^d\}. \tag{52}$$

Proof. Introduce the notation μ', r', μ'', r'', etc. as in Section 2.1. By definition of the family $\mathcal{S}_1^*$, the functions μ', σ'^2, μ'', σ''^2 are constant. Therefore, we write, say, μ' instead of $\mu'(t)$. We may rewrite (8) as follows:

$$\gamma'(t_1, t_2) = 2(\sigma'^2 - r'(t_1, t_2)) \text{ and } \gamma''(t_1, t_2) = 2(\sigma''^2 - r''(t_1, t_2)). \tag{53}$$

We start by proving the "if" part of the proposition. Assume for concreteness that (51) holds. Then, by (9),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{m}''_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi''(t_1), \dots, \xi''(t_n)) \in B - z] d\mathfrak{m}''(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi'(t_1) + N_0, \dots, \xi'(t_n) + N_0) \in B - z] d\mathfrak{m}''(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi'(t_1), \dots, \xi'(t_n)) \in B - (z + y)] d\mathfrak{m}''(z) d\mathfrak{n}_0(y).
\end{aligned}$$

For every non-negative function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ the following formula holds:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z + y) d\mathfrak{m}''(z) d\mathfrak{n}_0(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d(\mathfrak{m}'' * \mathfrak{n}_0)(x).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{m}''_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi'(t_1), \dots, \xi'(t_n)) \in B - x] d(\mathfrak{m}'' * \mathfrak{n}_0)(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[(\xi'(t_1), \dots, \xi'(t_n)) \in B - x] d\mathfrak{m}'(x) \\
&= \mathfrak{m}'_{t_1,\dots,t_n}(B).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (50).

Now we prove the "only if" part of the proposition. Assume that (50) holds. Without loss of generality we assume that $\sigma'^2 \le \sigma''^2$. Define

$$\mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{N}(\mu'' - \mu', \sigma''^2 - \sigma'^2),$$

and let $N_0 \sim \mathfrak{n}_0$ be a Gaussian variable independent of ξ' and ξ''. We will show that (51) holds.

We start by proving the first equality in (51). It follows from (50) that $\mathfrak{m}'_t = \mathfrak{m}''_t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Equivalently,

$$\mathfrak{m}' * \mathfrak{N}(\mu', \sigma'^2) = \mathfrak{m}'' * \mathfrak{N}(\mu'', \sigma''^2).$$

Then, by Lemma 6, $\mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{m}'' * \mathfrak{n}_0$. This proves the first equality in (51).

We claim that the second equality in (51) follows from the following statement: for all $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\gamma'(t_1, t_2) = \gamma''(t_1, t_2). \tag{54}$$

To see this, set for a moment $\tilde{\xi}'(t) = \xi'(t) + N_0$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{\xi}'(t) = \mu' + (\mu'' - \mu') = \mu'' = \mathbb{E}\xi''(t).$$

Elementary transformations using (53) and (54) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Cov}(\tilde{\xi}'(t_1), \tilde{\xi}'(t_2)) \\ &= r'(t_1, t_2) + (\sigma''^2 - \sigma'^2) = r''(t_1, t_2) = \operatorname{Cov}(\xi''(t_1), \xi''(t_2)). \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we are proving (54). We need to consider two cases.

Case 1. Assume that $\mathfrak{m}' = \alpha' \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha' > 0$, $\beta > 0$, $\lambda \ne 0$. It follows from $\mathfrak{m}'_t = \mathfrak{m}''_t$ that

$$\mathfrak{m}' * \mathfrak{N}(\mu', \sigma'^2) = \mathfrak{m}'' * \mathfrak{N}(\mu'', \sigma''^2).$$

The left-hand side of the above equation is of the form $\alpha \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$ for some α. Hence, using Lemma 7, we conclude that $\mathfrak{m}'' = \alpha'' \mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta \mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha'' > 0$.

Let us consider the two-dimensional distributions of $\mathfrak{P}'$. By (9),

$$\mathfrak{m}'_{t_1,t_2}(B) = \alpha' \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\lambda z} \mathfrak{n}'_{t_1,t_2}(B - z) dz + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{n}'_{t_1,t_2}(B - z) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Applying Lemma 3 twice, we get two measures $\mathfrak{m}'^{(\lambda)}_{t_1,t_2}$ and $\mathfrak{m}'^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}$ concentrated on $\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 = 0\}$ such that the following decomposition is valid:

$$\mathfrak{m}'_{t_1,t_2}(B) = \alpha' \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\lambda z} \mathfrak{m}'^{(\lambda)}_{t_1,t_2}(B - z) dz + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{m}'^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}(B - z) dz, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Furthermore, $\psi'_{t_1,t_2}(u)$, the Laplace transform of $\mathfrak{m}'^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}$, is given by

$$\psi'_{t_1,t_2}(u) = e^{\gamma'(t_1,t_2)u^2/2}. \tag{55}$$

Similar calculations can be done for $\mathfrak{m}''_{t_1,t_2}$. By (50), we must have $\mathfrak{m}'_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m}''_{t_1,t_2}$. By Lemma 4, this implies

$$\mathfrak{m}'^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m}''^{(0)}_{t_1,t_2}.$$

Comparing the Laplace transforms, we obtain (54).

Case 2. Assume that the condition of Case 1 is not satisfied. We define a point process $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}'_{t_1,t_2}$ as in (41) and (42) with $\vartheta = 1/2$: we set

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}'_{t_1,t_2} = \{U'_i + \xi'_i(t_1)/2 + \xi'_i(t_2)/2, i \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where $\{U'_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and ξ'_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are the starting points and the driving processes of the Gaussian system $\mathfrak{P}'$. Then $\tilde{\mathfrak{P}}'_{t_1,t_2}$ is a Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}$ whose intensity measure $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}'_{t_1,t_2}$ is given by the formula

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}'_{t_1,t_2} = \mathfrak{m}' * \mathfrak{N}\left(\mu', \frac{1}{2}\sigma'^2 + \frac{1}{2}r'(t_1,t_2)\right). \tag{56}$$

A simple calculation using (53) shows that

$$\mathfrak{m}'_{t_1} = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}'_{t_1,t_2} * \mathfrak{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{4}\gamma'(t_1,t_2)\right).$$

Similar calculations can be done for the pair $(\mathfrak{m}'', \xi'')$. By (50), we must have $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}'_{t_1,t_2} = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}''_{t_1,t_2}$. Denoting these equal measures for a moment by $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2} * \mathfrak{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{4}\gamma'(t_1,t_2)\right) = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2} * \mathfrak{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{4}\gamma''(t_1,t_2)\right).$$

Now assume that (54) does not hold for some $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then Lemma 8 implies that $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{t_1,t_2}$ is of the form $\tilde{\alpha}\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \tilde{\beta}\mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\tilde{\alpha} \geq 0$, $\tilde{\beta} \geq 0$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. Further, Lemma 7 applied to (56) yields that $\mathfrak{m}'$ is of the form $\alpha'\mathfrak{e}_\lambda + \beta'\mathfrak{e}_0$ for some $\alpha' \geq 0$, $\beta' \geq 0$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. In fact, the assumption $(\mathfrak{m}', \xi') \in \mathcal{S}_1^*$ implies that even $\alpha' > 0$, $\beta' > 0$. Hence, we are in the situation of Case 1, which is a contradiction.

The proof of Proposition 8 is complete. □

4 Open questions

We have considered only particles moving on the one-dimensional real line (although we allowed for a multidimensional time). An interesting question is whether it is possible to obtain an analogue of Theorem 1 for particles moving in a multidimensional Euclidian space.

Another problem is to classify all stationary systems of particles driven by independent Gaussian processes and starting at the points of an arbitrary point process (rather than a Poisson point process). It seems that to gain information from the stationarity of the one-dimensional distributions of such particle systems, the results of [9] should be used instead of that of [3].

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to M. Schlather for several useful remarks.

References

[1] Brown, B. M. and Resnick, S. I. (1977). Extreme values of independent stochastic processes. *J. Appl. Probab. 14*, 732–739.

[2] Brown, M. (1970). A property of Poisson processes and its application to macroscopic equilibrium of particle systems. *Ann. Math. Statist. 41*, 1935–1941.

[3] Deny, J. (1959-1960). Sur l'équation de convolution $\mu = \mu * \sigma$. *Séminaire Brelot-Choquet-Deny. Theorie du potentiel 4*, 1–11.

[4] Doob, J. L. (1953). *Stochastic processes.* New York: Wiley.

[5] Dürr, D., Goldstein, S., and Lebowitz, J. L. (1985). Asymptotics of particle trajectories in infinite one-dimensional systems with collisions. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 38*, 573–597.

[6] Harris, T. (1965). Diffusion with 'collisions' between particles. *J. Appl. Probab. 2*, 223–338.

[7] Kabluchko, Z., Schlather, M., and de Haan, L. (2009). Stationary max-stable fields associated to negative definite functions. *Ann. Probab. Accepted*.

[8] Liggett, T. and Port, S. (1988). Systems of independent Markov chains. *Stochastic Processes Appl.* **28**, 1, 1–22.

[9] Liggett, T. M. (1978). Random invariant measures for Markov chains and independent particle systems. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verw. Geb. 45*, 297–313.

[10] Martin-Löf, A. (1976). Limit theorems for the motion of a Poisson system of independent Markovian particles with high density. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verw. Geb. 34*, 205–223.

[11] Penrose, M. (1991). Minima of independent Bessel processes and of distances between Brownian particles. *J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser.* **43**, 2, 355–366.

[12] Pickands, J. (1969). Upcrossing probabilities for stationary Gaussian processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 145*, 51–73.

[13] Resnick, S. I. (1987). *Extreme values, regular variation, and point processes.* Applied Probability. Vol. 4. New York etc.: Springer–Verlag.

[14] Spitzer, F. (1969). Uniform motion with elastic collision of an infinite particle system. *J. Math. Mech. 18*, 973–989.